

Experiments with the WDVV equations for the gluino-condensate prepotential: the cubic (two-cut) case

H.Itoyama¹ and A.Morozov²

¹ *Department of Mathematics and Physics, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan*

² *Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow*

November, 2002

Abstract

We demonstrate by explicit calculation that the first two terms in the CIV-DV prepotential for the two-cut case satisfy the generalized WDVV equations, just as in all other known examples of hyperelliptic Seiberg-Witten models. The WDVV equations are non-trivial in this situation, provided the set of moduli is extended as compared to the Dijkgraaf-Vafa suggestion and includes also moduli, associated with the positions of the cuts (not only with their lengths). Expression for the extra modulus dictated by WDVV equation, however, appears different from a naive expectation implied by the Whitham theory. Moreover, for every value of the "quantum-deformation parameter" $1/g_3$, we actually find an entire one-parameter family of solutions to the WDVV equations, of which the conventional prepotential is just a single point.

In this paper we report on some "experimental" results, confirming the validity of the WDVV equations for the realistic prepotential of gluino-condensate fields S_i [1]. We follow the program suggested in our recent paper [2], which implies, among other things, that the considerations of R.Dijkgraaf and C.Vafa [3] (see [4] for the further developments) should be supplemented to include extra moduli, associated with positions of the cuts in the planar matrix model solution. The purpose of the present paper is to confirm, that the "spherical" WDVV equations [5, 6, 7] are indeed satisfied after these moduli are included, as expected on general grounds in all hyperelliptic examples of Seiberg-Witten theory [8] and its interpretation in terms of integrable systems [9]. However, it turns out that the naive expectation of [2] for explicit choice of these extra T -moduli should be modified already at the level of the two-cut solution (when there are just two S -moduli and one extra T -modulus). Interpretation of these results and their generalization to higher number of cuts n remain for the subject of further analysis.

1 Introduction

The prepotential, which will be the subject of our discussion, has the form [1, 3]:

$$\mathcal{F}(S, T) = \mathcal{F}_{pert}(S, T) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g_{n+1}^{-k} \mathcal{F}_{k+2}(S, T) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{k+2}(S, T)$ is a polynomial of degree $k + 2$ in S 's, with coefficients made from $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_i - \alpha_j$ (see (2) below) and these α_{ij} are somehow incorporated into the $n - 1$ auxiliary *flat* moduli T_i . It can be obtained after throwing away some unwanted terms from the Dijkgraaf-Vafa prepotential, built by the common rules of the SW theory from a family of hyperelliptic complex curves (Riemann surfaces)

$$Y^2 = P_n^2(x) + P_n(x) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{S}_i(x)}{x - \alpha_i}, \quad P_n(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \alpha_i) \quad (2)$$

with the one form

$$dS_{DV} = Y(x)dx \quad (3)$$

defined on every curve. The *flat* moduli S_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ are infinite series in integer powers of $\tilde{S}_i$ with α -dependent coefficients, while α -dependence is somehow expressed through the remaining $n - 1$ *flat* moduli T_i , $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. We refer to [2] for further details.

The perturbative (logarithmic) piece of the prepotential can be easily obtained from

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_{pert}}{\partial S_i} = \int_{\gamma_i + \rho_i}^{\Lambda} dS_{pert} = \dots + S_i \log \frac{\Lambda}{\rho_i} + \sum_{j \neq i} S_j \log \frac{\Lambda}{\alpha_{ij}} \quad (4)$$

with

$$dS_{pert}(x) = P_n(x)dx + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{S_i}{x - \alpha_i} dx \quad (5)$$

and

$$(i\pi g_{n+1})\rho_i^2 \prod_{j \neq i}^n \alpha_{ij} = S_i + O(S^2) \quad (6)$$

(eq.(6) is the condition that $\alpha_i \pm \rho_i$ approximate – in the leading order in small S 's – the ramification points of the curve (2)). Altogether, these formulas imply that¹

$$2\pi i \mathcal{F}_{pert}(S, T) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n S_i^2 \log S_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i < j}^n (S_i^2 - 4S_i S_j + S_j^2) \log \alpha_{ij} \quad (7)$$

In what follows we present some experimental evidence that the WDVV equations in the form, suggested in ref.[6],

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_I \check{\mathcal{F}}_J^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_K = \check{\mathcal{F}}_K \check{\mathcal{F}}_J^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_I \quad (8)$$

¹ The terms $g_{n+1} (W(\Lambda) \sum_i S_i - \sum_i W(\alpha_i) S_i)$ with $W'(x) = P_n(x)$ and $(\sum_i S_i)^2 \log \Lambda$ are omitted from this expression. These are harmless for considerations below as they are at most quadratic in moduli and drop out of the prepotential's third derivatives. Note that $\tilde{T}_k = W(\alpha_i)$ can be an interesting possibility to try for the role of T moduli.

(with matrices $\check{\mathcal{F}}_L$ made out of the third derivatives of the prepotential $\mathcal{F}(a_I)$, $(\check{\mathcal{F}}_L)_{MN} = \mathcal{F}_{LMN} = \partial^3 \mathcal{F} / \partial a_L \partial a_M \partial a_N$), can still hold for this prepotential, at least for the cubic superpotential, when there are just two S -moduli and one T -modulus. Dependence on the T -modulus which is not-quite-expected is needed, however, to make these equations true. Instead of being equal to $\tilde{T}_1 \sim \alpha_1 \alpha_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^2$, according to the general rule [10, 11, 2]²

$$\tilde{T}_k = \frac{1}{k} res_{\infty} x^{-k} dS(x) = \frac{1}{k} res_{\infty} x^{-k} P_n(x) dx, \quad (9)$$

it appears (experimentally!) that $T \sim \alpha_{12}^3$. (Note that another naive choice $T_i = \alpha_i - \alpha_n$ is also ruled out). It remains for the future research to find an interpretation of this metamorphosis and, even more important, to understand if it can be extended to higher corrections and more sophisticated superpotentials (with $n > 2$). For $n > 2$ it is not easy even to reexpress the differences α_{ij} through $n - 1$ flat moduli T_i , which are expected to be polynomial in α_{ij} .

From now on we consider just the case of $n = 2$, but introduce some free parameters into (7) and into $\mathcal{F}_3$ in order to find what kind of restrictions are imposed on these parameters by the WDVV equations.

2 Perturbative $n = 2$ case

Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{pert}(S_1, S_2, T) = \frac{1}{2} S_1^2 \log S_1 + \frac{1}{2} S_2^2 \log S_2 + \frac{\nu}{2} (S_1^2 - 2bS_1S_2 + S_2^2) \log T \quad (10)$$

(actually, in DV theory $b = 2$ and $T^{-\nu} = \alpha_{12}$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_{pert}}{\partial S_1} &= S_1 \log S_1 + \nu(S_1 - bS_2) \log T, \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_{pert}}{\partial S_2} &= S_2 \log S_2 + \nu(S_2 - bS_1) \log T, \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}_{pert}}{\partial T} &= \frac{\nu}{2T} (S_1^2 - 2bS_1S_2 + S_2^2), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and matrices (we omit the index *perp* in what follows)

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{S_1} & 0 & \frac{\nu}{T} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{\nu b}{T} \\ \frac{\nu}{T} & -\frac{\nu b}{T} & -\frac{\nu(S_1 - bS_2)}{T^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

² From experience with the other SW models [11] one can conjecture that the x^{-n} factors in (9) can be in fact substituted by $w^{-k/n}$ (see [2] for the definition of w), but this difference is inessential for our considerations in this paper.

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\frac{\nu b}{T} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{S_2} & \frac{\nu}{T} \\ -\frac{\nu b}{T} & \frac{\nu}{T} & -\frac{\nu(S_2 - bS_1)}{T^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_T = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\nu}{T} & -\frac{\nu b}{T} & -\frac{\nu(S_1 - bS_2)}{T^2} \\ -\frac{\nu b}{T} & \frac{\nu}{T} & -\frac{\nu(S_2 - bS_1)}{T^2} \\ -\frac{\nu(S_1 - bS_2)}{T^2} & -\frac{\nu(S_2 - bS_1)}{T^2} & \frac{\nu(S_1^2 - 2bS_1S_2 + S_2^2)}{T^3} \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

Further,

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} = \left(-\frac{\nu^2 b^2}{S_2 T^2} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\nu(\nu+1)}{T^2} + \frac{\nu b S_1}{S_2 T^2} & -\frac{\nu^2 b}{T^2} & \frac{\nu b}{S_2 T} \\ -\frac{\nu^2 b}{T^2} & -\frac{\nu^2 b^2}{T^2} & 0 \\ \frac{\nu b}{S_2 T} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (15)$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_1 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} = \left(-\frac{\nu^2 b^2}{S_2 T^2} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\nu(\nu+1)(S_2 - bS_1)}{S_1 S_2 T^2} & -\frac{\nu^2 b}{S_1 T^2} & \frac{\nu b}{S_1 S_2 T} \\ -\frac{\nu^2 b^2}{S_2 T^2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\nu^2(\nu+1)(b^2 - 1)}{T^3} & \frac{\nu^3 b(b^2 - 1)}{T^3} & \frac{\nu^2 b}{S_2 T^2} \end{pmatrix} = \quad (16)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(\nu+1)(S_2 - bS_1)}{\nu b^2 S_1} & \frac{S_2}{b S_1} & -\frac{T}{\nu b S_1} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2 - 1)S_2}{b^2 T} & -\frac{\nu(b^2 - 1)S_2}{b T} & -\frac{1}{b} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_T = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2 - 1)S_2}{b^2 T} & 0 & \frac{(\nu+1)(b^2 - 1)S_1 S_2}{b^2 T^2} \\ -\frac{\nu(b^2 - 1)S_2}{b T} & 0 & \frac{\nu(b^2 - 1)S_1 S_2}{b T^2} \\ -\frac{1}{b} & 1 & \frac{S_1 - bS_2}{b T} \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

Finally,

$$\check{\mathcal{F}}_1 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_T = \begin{pmatrix} * & \frac{\nu}{T} & \frac{\nu S_1}{bT^2} + \xi \frac{S_2}{b^2 T^2} \\ \frac{\nu}{T} & * & -\frac{\nu(S_1 - bS_2)}{T^2} \\ \frac{\nu S_1}{bT^2} + \eta \frac{S_2}{b^2 T^2} & -\frac{\nu(S_1 - bS_2)}{T^2} & * \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= b^2 - 1 - \nu, \\ \eta &= \nu^2(b^2 - 1)^2 - \nu(2b^2 - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Stars stand for diagonal elements that we do not need.³ This matrix is symmetric, provided b and ν are related by the equation $\xi = \eta$:

$$\nu^2(b^2 - 1)^2 - \nu(2b^2 - 1) = (b^2 - 1 - \nu), \quad (20)$$

or

$$\nu^2(b^2 - 1) - 2\nu - 1 = 0, \quad (21)$$

or

$$\nu = \pm \frac{1}{b \mp 1} \quad (22)$$

For $b = 2$ this gives two solutions: $\nu = 1$ and $\nu = -\frac{1}{3}$. The second choice, $\nu = -\frac{1}{3}$, is nicely consistent with the homogeneity of the prepotential, but it implies that $T = \alpha_{12}^3$, what seems inconsistent with any *a priori* formula like (9).

3 Next order: $n = 2$ case

For corrected prepotential

$$\mathcal{F}_{pert}(S_1, S_2, T) + f(S_1, S_2, T) \quad (23)$$

we need that

$$\mathcal{A} = \check{f}_1 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_T + \check{\mathcal{F}}_1 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{f}_T - \check{\mathcal{F}}_1 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{f}_2 \check{\mathcal{F}}_2^{-1} \check{\mathcal{F}}_T + O(f^2) \quad (24)$$

be symmetric.

Take the first "non-perturbative" correction in the form

$$f(S_1, S_2, T) \sim \frac{1}{g_3} \mathcal{F}_3(S_1, S_2, T) \sim (S_1^3 - cS_1^2 S_2 + cS_1 S_2^2 - S_2^3) T^{3\mu} \quad (25)$$

³ Zeroes in the second row of (16) and the second column in (17) are pertinent properties of all matrices $\check{\mathcal{F}}$ composed of third derivatives, they are independent of particular ansatz for $\mathcal{F}$. The same is true with coincidence of entries 12 and 21, 23 and 32 in (18): the only non-trivial condition obtained from (18) being symmetric (WDVV equation), imposed non-trivially on $\mathcal{F}$ in the $n = 3$ case, is an equality between the entries 13 and 31.

The overall coefficient like g_3^{-1} does not play a role in the linearized equation (24). The ansatz is consistent with [1], according to their calculation $c = -\frac{15}{2}$ and $T^{-\mu} = \alpha_{12}$. (Since at the perturbative level we already obtained $T = \alpha_{12}^3$ for the CIV-DV prepotential. This implies that we need $\mu = -1/3$ for it). Substituting the ansatz (25) into (24) and making use of (16) and (17), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} = & \begin{pmatrix} f_{111} & f_{112} & f_{11T} \\ f_{122} & f_{222} & f_{12T} \\ f_{11T} & f_{12T} & f_{1TT} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T} & 0 & \frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{b^2T^2} \\ -\frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_2}{bT} & 0 & \frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{bT^2} \\ -\frac{1}{b} & 1 & \frac{S_1-bS_2}{bT} \end{pmatrix} + \\ & + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(\nu+1)(S_2-bS_1)}{\nu b^2S_1} & \frac{S_2}{bS_1} & -\frac{T}{\nu bS_1} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T} & -\frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_2}{bT} & -\frac{1}{b} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \\ & \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T}((\nu+1)f_{112} + b\nu f_{122}) + \frac{1}{2}f_{12T} + f_{11T} & 0 & -\frac{(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{b^2T^2}((\nu+1)f_{112} + b\nu f_{122}) + \frac{2S_2-S_1}{2T}f_{12T} + f_{1TT} \\ \frac{(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T}((\nu+1)f_{122} + b\nu f_{222}) + \frac{1}{2}f_{22T} + f_{12T} & 0 & -\frac{(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{b^2T^2}((\nu+1)f_{122} + b\nu f_{222}) + \frac{2S_2-S_1}{2T}f_{22T} + f_{2TT} \\ \frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T}f_{12T} + \frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_2}{bT}f_{22T} + \frac{1}{2}f_{2TT} + f_{1TT} & 0 & -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{b^2T^2}f_{12T} - \frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{bT^2}f_{22T} + \frac{2S_2-S_1}{2T}f_{2TT} + f_{TTT} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The last matrix at the r.h.s. is obtained by evaluating the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} f_{11T} & f_{12T} & f_{1TT} \\ f_{12T} & f_{22T} & f_{2TT} \\ f_{1TT} & f_{2TT} & f_{TTT} \end{pmatrix} - \right. \\ & \left. - \begin{pmatrix} f_{112} & f_{122} & f_{12T} \\ f_{122} & f_{222} & f_{22T} \\ f_{12T} & f_{22T} & f_{2TT} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_2}{b^2T} & 0 & \frac{(\nu+1)(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{b^2T^2} \\ -\frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_2}{bT} & 0 & \frac{\nu(b^2-1)S_1S_2}{bT^2} \\ -\frac{1}{b} & 1 & \frac{S_1-bS_2}{bT} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

That matrix (26) be symmetric can seem to impose three relations. In fact, two of them $\mathcal{A}_{12} = \mathcal{A}_{21}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{23} = \mathcal{A}_{32}$ are automatically satisfied (for the composition of 3×3 matrices made from third derivatives, actually $\mathcal{A}_{12} = f_{11T}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{23} = f_{1TT}$). The only non-trivial one is the equality between the 13 and 31 entries, $\mathcal{A}_{13} - \mathcal{A}_{31} = 0$. After a tedious calculation we obtain for this difference with the ansatz (25):

$$\begin{aligned}
& b^2 S_1 T^{3-3\mu} (\mathcal{A}_{13} - \mathcal{A}_{31}) = \\
& = \left[bS_1^2 + (2(b^2 - 1)\nu + (b^2 - 2))S_1 S_2 \right] \cdot 6\mu(3S_1 - cS_2) + \\
& + \left[\frac{(\nu + 1)}{\nu}(S_1^2 + S_2^2) + \frac{2((b^4 - 1)\nu^2 + (b^2 - 2)\nu - 1)}{\nu b} S_1 S_2 \right] \cdot 6\mu c(S_2 - S_1) + \\
& \quad \left[bS_2^2 + (2(b^2 - 1)\nu + (b^2 - 2))S_1 S_2 \right] \cdot 6\mu(cS_1 - 3S_2) + \\
& + \left[\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu} S_2 + \frac{\nu - 1}{\nu} bS_1 \right] \cdot 3\mu(3\mu - 1)(3S_1^2 - 2cS_1 S_2 + cS_2^2) + \\
& + \left[\frac{\nu - 1}{\nu} bS_2 + \frac{\nu + 1}{\nu} S_1 \right] \cdot 3\mu(3\mu - 1)(-cS_1^2 + 2cS_1 S_2 - 3S_2^2) + \\
& \quad + 3b\mu(3\mu - 1)(3\mu - 2)(-S_1^3 + cS_1^2 S_2 - cS_1 S_2^2 + S_2^3) + \\
& + \left[\frac{6(\nu + 1)(b^2 - 1)}{b^2} - \frac{2(b^2 - 1)[(b^2 - b + 1)\nu^2 - (b - 2)\nu + 1]}{b\nu} c \right] \cdot S_1 S_2 + \\
& \quad + (b^2 - 1)((b^2 - 1)\nu - 1) \left[-6\nu + \frac{2(\nu + 1)[(2b - 1)\nu - 1]}{\nu b^2} c \right] \cdot S_2^2 = \\
& \\
& = (3\mu + 1) \left\{ \frac{3\mu}{\nu} [(\nu + 1)c - b(3\nu - 3\mu + 1)](S_2^3 - S_1^3) + \right. \\
& \quad + \left([3\mu(3\mu - 1)b^2 + 2(3\mu - 1)b + 4 + \right. \\
& \quad + (2(b^3 - 3b + 4) - 3(3b - 2)b\mu)\nu - 4(b^2 - 1)(b^2 - b + 1)\nu^2] c + \\
& \quad + [3\mu(\nu + 1) + 4(b^2 - 1)\nu^2 + 2(b^2 - 3)\nu - 2] S_1^2 S_2 + \\
& \quad + \left(\left[\frac{4((b^4 - 1)\nu^2 + (b^2 - 2)\nu - 1)}{\nu b} - \frac{(3\mu - 2)^2 b}{\nu} - 4b^2 \nu + 4\nu - \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - 2b^2 + 2 - \frac{2}{\nu} + 2b + (3\mu - 2) \frac{3b(\nu - 1) - 2(\nu + 1)}{\nu} \right] c - \right. \\
& \quad \left. - [12(b^2 - 1)\nu + 6(b^2 - 2) + (\nu + 1)(3\mu - 2)] \right) S_1 S_2^2 \Big\} + \\
& \quad + ((b^2 - 1)\nu^2 - 2\nu - 1) \left\{ \left(\frac{b^2 - b + 1}{b\nu} c - \frac{6}{\nu} \right) S_1^2 S_2 + \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\frac{2(2b - 1)}{b^2 \nu} c - \frac{6}{\nu} \right) ((b^2 - 1)\nu - 1) S_1 S_2^2 \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The r.h.s. is a linear combination of sophisticated expressions⁴ with coefficients equal to $3\mu + 1$ and $(b^2 - 1)\nu^2 - 2\nu - 1$. Thus it vanishes, and WDVV eqs hold in this approximation whenever $3\mu = -1$ and the condition (21) for logarithmic WDVV to hold is fulfilled. No restriction on parameter c appears in this approximation.

4 Conclusion

To conclude, we proved that perturbative prepotentials of the given type, satisfying the *spherical* WDVV equations of ref.[6], do exist, at least in the case of just two S -moduli and one T -modulus and at the first order of expansion in powers of S .

Moreover, solutions form an entire one-parametric family (21), of which the CIV-DV prepotential is just a single point $b = 2$. It is a question, what kind of SW system can correspond to generic solution with any b .

Furthermore, we demonstrated that, as usual with the WDVV equations, once they are satisfied at the perturbative (logarithmic) level, the prepotential can be corrected so that they are satisfied at the next order – and, perhaps, further and further, so that every logarithmic solution of WDVV eqs gives rise to (at least a one-parametric, with dimensionful parameter g_{n+1}) family of solutions. Actually, to the approximation that we considered, one more dimensionless parameter, c , remained unrestricted, but it can still be fixed in the next approximations.

All these imply that the DV system does not provide a *generic* solution of the given type to WDVV equations. One can regard this as a confirmation of the universality-classes hypothesis of ref.[2] (see the end of s.5.1 of that paper). This emphasizes the need to study *regularized* DV system, the "hidden-sector" curve and the DV limiting procedure (see [2] for more details).

5 Acknowledgements

A.M. acknowledges the support of JSPS and the hospitality of the Osaka City University during his stay at Japan. Our work is partly supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (14540284) from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Japan (H.I), and by the Russian President's grant 00-15-99296, RFBR-01-02-17488, INTAS 00-561 and by Volkswagen-Stiftung (A.M.).

References

- [1] F.Cachazo, K.A.Intriligator and C.Vafa, *Nucl.Phys.* **B603** (2001) 3, hep-th/0103067; F.Cachazo and C.Vafa, hep-th/0206017.
- [2] H.Ityama and A.Morozov, hep-th/0211245.
- [3] R.Dijkgraaf and C.Vafa, *Nucl.Phys.* **B644** (2002) 3-20, hep-th/0206255; *Nucl.Phys.* **B644** (2002) 21-39, hep-th/0207106; hep-th/0208048.

⁴ In fact, the overloaded formulas at the r.h.s. of (28) can still contain errors inside the curly brackets; what we were careful to check is the fact that the coefficients are indeed equal to $3\mu + 1$ and $(b^2 - 1)\nu^2 - 2\nu - 1$, what is the only thing important for our discussion. Still, the formulas deserve independent check with the help of Mathematica or Maple.

- [4] L.Chekhov and A.Mironov, hep-th/0209085;
N.Dorey, T.J.Hollowood, S.Prem Kumar and A.Sinkovics, hep-th/0209089; hep-th/0209099;
M.Aganagic and C.Vafa, hep-th/0209138;
F.Ferrari, hep-th/0210135; hep-th/0211069;
H.Fuji and Y.Ookouchi, hep-th/0210148;
D.Berenstein, hep-th/0210183;
R.Dijkgraaf, S.Gukov, V.Kazakov and C.Vafa, hep-th/0210238;
N.Dorey, T.J.Hollowood and S.Prem Kumar, hep-th/0210239;
A.Gorsky, hep-th/0210281;
R.Argurio, V.L.Campos, G.Ferretti and R.Heise, hep-th/0210291;
J.McGreevy, hep-th/0211009;
R. Dijkgraaf, M.T. Grisaru, C.S. Lam, C. Vafa and D. Zanon, hep-th/0211017;
H.Suzuki, hep-th/0211052;
I.Bena and R.Roiban, hep-th/0211075;
Y.Demasure and R.A.Janik, hep-th/0211082;
M.Aganagic, A.Klemm, M.Marino and C.Vafa, hep-th/0211098;
R.Gopakumar, hep-th/0211100;
S.Naculich, H.Schnitzer and N.Wyllard, hep-th/0211123;
F.Cachazo, M.R.Douglas, N.Seiberg and E.Witten, hep-th/0211170;
R.Dijkgraaf, A.Neitzke and C.Vafa, hep-th/0211194;
Y.Tachikawa, hep-th/0211189;
B.Feng, hep-th/0211202;
A.Klemm, M.Marino and S.Theisen, hep-th/0211216;
B.Feng and Y.-H. He, hep-th/0211234;
V.Kazakov and A.Marshakov, hep-th/0211236;
R.Dijkgraaf, A.Sinkovics and M.Tmerhan, hep-th/0211241;
R. Argurio, V.L. Campos, G. Ferretti, R.Heise, hep-th/0211249 ;
S.Naculich, H.Schnitzer and N.Wyllard, hep-th/0211254.
- [5] E.Witten, *Nucl.Phys.* **B340** (1990) 281; *Surveys Diff.Geom.* **1** (1991) 243;
R.Dijkgraaf, E.Verlinde and H.Verlinde, *Nucl.Phys.* **B352** (1991) 59;
B.Dubrovin, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1620**, Springer, Berlin, 1996, 120-348, hep-th/9407018;
E.Getzler, alg-geom/9612004.
- [6] A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, *Phys.Lett.* **B389** (1996) 43-52, hep-th/9607109;
Mod.Phys.Lett. **A12** (1997) 773-788, hep-th/9701014;
Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A15** (2000) 1157-1206, hep-th/9701123.
- [7] E.Getzler, math.AG/9801003; math.AG/9812026;
A.Morozov, *Phys.Lett.* **B427** (1998) 93-96, hep-th/9711194;
G.Bertoldi and M.Matone, *Phys.Lett.* **B425** (1998) 104-106, hep-th/9712039; *Phys.Rev.* **D57** (1998) 6483-6485, hep-th/9712109;
A.Mironov and A.Morozov, *Phys.Lett.* **B424** (1998) 48-52, hep-th/9712177;
K.Ito and S.-K.Yang, *Phys.Lett.* **B433** (1998) 56-62, hep-th/9803126;
J.M.Isidro, *Nucl.Phys.* **B539** (1999) 379-402, hep-th/9805051;
J.Kalayci and Y.Nutku, *J.Phys.* **A31** (1998) 723, hep-th/9810076;
H.W.Braden, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov, A.Morozov, *Phys.Lett.* **B448** (1999) 195-202, hep-th/9812078;
R.Martini and P.K.H.Gragert, *J.Nonlinear Math.Phys.* **6** (1999), No.1, 1-4, hep-th/9901166;

- A.Veselov, *Phys.Lett.* **A261** (1999) 297-302, hep-th/9902142; hep-th/0105020;
S.Natanzon, *J.Geom.Phys.* **39** (2001) 323-336, hep-th/9904103;
Y.Ohta, *J.Math.Phys.* **41** (2000) 6042-6047, hep-th/9905126;
L.Hoevenaars, P.Kersten and R.Martini, *Phys.Lett.* **B503** (2001) 189, hep-th/0012133;
A.Dzhamay, hep-th/0003034;
L.Hoevenaars and R.Martini, *Lett.Math.Phys.* **57** (2001) 175-183, hep-th/0102190;
B.de Wit and A.Marshakov, *Theor.Math.Phys.* **129** (2001) 1504-1510, hep-th/0105289;
H.Aratyn and J.van de Leur, hep-th/0111243;
A.Marshakov, *Theor.Math.Phys.* **132** (2002) 895-933, hep-th/0201267;
H.W.Braden and A.Marshakov, *Phys.Lett.* **B541** (2002) 376-383, hep-th/0205308;
L.Hoevenaars, hep-th/0202007.
- [8] N.Seiberg and E.Witten, *Nucl.Phys.* **B426** (1994) 19 (Erratum-ibid. **B430** (1994) 485), hep-th/9407087; *ibidem*, **B431** (1994) 484, hep-th/9408099; hep-th/9607163;
A.Klemm, W.Lerche, S.Theisen and S.Yankielowicz, *Phys.Lett.* **B344** (1995) 169, hep-th/9411048;
P.Argyres and A.Farragi, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **74** (1995) 3931, hep-th/9411057;
A.Hanany and Y.Oz, *Nucl.Phys.* **B452** (1995) 283, hep-th/9505074;
P.C. Argyres and A.D. Shapere, *Nucl.Phys.* **B461** (1996) 437, hep-th/9509175;
N.Seiberg, *Phys.Lett. B388* (1996) 753-760.
- [9] A.Gorsky, I.Krichever, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, *Phys.Lett.* **B355** (1995) 466, hep-th/9505035;
E.Martinec and N.Warner, *Nucl.Phys.* **B459** (1996) 97-112, hep-th/9509161; hep-th/9511052;
T.Nakatsu and K.Takasaki, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A11** (1996) 157-168, hep-th/9509162;
R.Donagi and E.Witten, *Nucl.Phys.* **B460** (1996) 299, hep-th/9510101;
T.Eguchi and S.Yang, *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A11** (1996) 131-138, hep-th/9510183;
H.Itayama and A.Morozov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B477** (1996) 855, hep-th/9511126; hep-th/9601168.
- [10] H.Itayama and A.Morozov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B491** (1997) 529, hep-th/9512161.
- [11] A.Gorsky, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov, A.Morozov, *Nucl.Phys.* **B527** (1998) 690-716, hep-th/9802007.